

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, 10, 17, and 27 are amended to more clearly point out that which is being claimed.

Claims 8, 16 and 23 have been rewritten in independent form, as suggested. Claims 8, 16 and 23 are therefore in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-27 are pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-22, 24-25, and 27 stand rejected as being anticipated by Little et al. It is noted herein, that the Office Action appears to list the wrong U.S. Patent No. for Little et al. in the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection. The Office Action stated U.S. Patent No. 6,331,866, when the correct number is 6,204,846. The Applicants submit this response based on an assumption that the above rejections are based on Little et al. (6,204,846) as opposed to Eisenberg (6,331,866). Please advise Applicants if this assumption is incorrect, in which case the Applicants reserve the right to retract and/or restate any amendments and/or remarks made herein.

Applicants respectfully traverse these stated rejections for at least the following reasons and with regard to the amended claims.

Little et al. disclose various techniques for displaying data that can be scrolled through using a mouse pointer and scroll bar. These techniques include monitoring user inputs and changing/resizing the subset of data being displayed

1 based on the scroll bar slider position, changing the size of the slider based on the
2 amount of data available, and popping up informative/selectable information
3 nearby the slider.

4 To the contrary, independent **Claim 1** is directed towards a method for use
5 in a graphical user interface. The recited method includes determining an offset
6 value between an object's position and an input position, and dynamically and
7 gradually reducing the offset value by correctively adjusting the input position
8 with respect to the object's position.
9

10 *Little et al.* fail to disclose or even reasonably suggest such a method. For
11 example, *Little et al.* fail to dynamically and gradually reduce such an offset by
12 correctively adjusting the input position with respect to the object's position. In
13 *Little et al.* the slider is moved as directed by the mouse pointer, however the
14 mouse pointer is not correctively adjusted with respect to the slider's position.
15

16 Consequently, Claim 1 is patentable over *Little et al.*, as are **Claims 2-7**
17 **and 9**, which depend from Claim 1 and recite further features/elements in the novel
18 method.

19 Independent **Claim 10** is directed towards a computer-readable medium
20 having computer-executable instructions for causing at least one processing unit to
21 perform acts including determining an offset value between an object's position
22 and an input position, and dynamically and gradually reducing the offset value by
23 correctively adjusting the input position with respect to the object's position.
24
25

1 For at least the same reasons as presented above with respect to Claim 1,
2 Claim 10 is patentable over *Little et al.*, as are **Claims 11-15**, which depend from
3 Claim 10 and recite further features/elements in the novel computer-readable
4 medium.

5 Independent **Claim 17** is directed towards an apparatus that includes logic
6 configured to determine an offset value between an object's position and an input
7 position, and dynamically and gradually reduce the offset value by correctively
8 adjusting the input position with respect to the object's position.

9
10 For at least the same reasons as presented above with respect to Claim 1,
11 Claim 17 is patentable over *Little et al.*, as are **Claims 18-22, 24, 25 and 27**,
12 which depend from Claim 17 and recite further features/elements in the novel
13 apparatus.

14
15 **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**
16

17 **Claim 26** stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable
18 over *Little et al.* in view of Shieh (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,083). Applicants
19 respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

20 *Shieh* adds to the teachings of *Little et al.* by disclosing the use of a
21 touchscreen as in input device. *Shieh* does not, however, disclose or even
22 reasonably suggest an apparatus that includes logic configured to determine an
23 offset value between an object's position and an input position, and dynamically
24
25

1 and gradually reduce the offset value by correctively adjusting the input position
2 with respect to the object's position.

3 Consequently, Claim 26 is patentable over *Little et al.* in view of *Shieh*.

4
5 **Conclusion**

6 For at least the reasons presented above, the claims are clearly patentable
7 over the cited art. It is respectfully requested, therefore, that the rejections be
8 reconsidered and withdrawn and the application be allowed.
9

10
11 Respectfully Submitted,

12
13 Dated: 8/14/2003

14 By: 

15 Thomas A. Jolly
16 Reg. No. 39,241
17 (509) 324-9256
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25